DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 396 CE 007 133

AUTHOR Scott, Thomas R.
TITLE The Role of the Illinois Public Community College President and Recent Change Perceived by the President, the Board Member, the Administration, the Faculty, and the Student.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 66p.; Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference (Toronto, Ontario, April 8, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Adult Education; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Educational Research; Enrollment; Governing Boards; Junior Colleges; *Presidents; Questionnaires; Role Perception; *State Surveys; Students
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the role activities of the community college president. Data were collected from a questionnaire distributed among the 48 community colleges in Illinois in 1975. In all, 312 persons at 29 participating colleges completed useable questionnaires. The data indicated that: (1) the present college president's perceived role activity expectations are different according to the perception of presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students; (2) their perceived role activity expectations are not different when analyzed by size of college; (3) their perceived role activities are not different when analyzed by type of college--rural/urban; and (4) their perceived role activities are different as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students whether the president is performing or not performing his role activities. A total of 19 items were significant beyond the .05 level when examined by status groups; 3 items were significant when examined by enrollment; 4 items were significant when examined by type of college; and 20 items were significant when examined the second time by status groups. It was evident that, of the independent variables of status groups, enrollment, and type of college, significant differences existed primarily in the area of status groups. (JR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123396

THE ROLE OF THE ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT AND RECENT CHANGE PERCEIVED BY THE PRESIDENT, THE BOARD MEMBER, THE ADMINISTRATION, THE FACULTY, AND THE STUDENT

A PAPER

PRESENTED AT

THE ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH CONFERENCE

AT TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA

BY

c THOMAS R. SCOTT

APRIL 8, 1976

NOTE: RESEARCH COMPLETED AUGUST, 1975

CE007133

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas R. Scott

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PAPER OUTLINE

FOREWARD 1

NEED 1

DEFINITION OF TERMS 1

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY 3

REVIEW OF LITERATURE 4

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY 4

HYPOTHESES 6

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 7

LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY 12

A REVIEW OF THE PROCEDURES 14

THE POPULATION 14

METHOD OF GATHERING DATA 15

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA 18

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY 22

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 44

APPENDIXES 55

FOREWORD

The purpose of this study was to define the role of the community college president in terms of (1) the traditional past, (2) the evolving present, and (3) the future.

NEED

The need for the study was based on the rapid growth of new community colleges since the Illinois Junior College Act of 1965.[1] This Act was designed to make provision for all communities to have a college which further necessitates the need for defining the community college president's role. The role was, for the greater part, one of newness and in the process of "coming of age" needing clarification.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Administration

In this study, administration pertains to college deans, bursars, registrars, comptrollers, librarians, and any persons designated as directors.

---

[1]State of Illinois, 74th General Assembly, The Laws of Illinois, Vol. I (Springfield: State of Illinois, 1965), pp. 1528-1558.

Community College

Community college, as used in this study, is used synonymously with the former two-year, junior college, now community college operated under the direction of the Illinois Board of Higher Education and coordination of the Illinois Community College Board.

Faculty

Faculty, in this study, pertains to persons teaching or counseling under a full-time contract at a public community college.

Large Colleges

Large colleges, in this study, include those public community colleges with full-time student enrollments of 2,001 or more.

President

President, as used in this study, pertains to the chief administrator of the public community two-year college.

Role

Role, in this study, is a set of expectations applied to an incumbent president; the expectations applied were in terms of his/her performance as presented by Gross in Explorations in Role Analysis.[2]

---

[2]Neal Gross and others, Exploration in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendent (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).

Rural

Rural, in this study, pertains to colleges located in rural settings outside of city limits.

Small Colleges

Small colleges, in this study, include those with a student enrollment (FTE) of 2,000 or less.

Status

Status, in this study, refers to board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students.

Students

Students, in this study, pertain to students designated as being full-time day students at a public community college.

Urban Colleges

Urban colleges, in this study, pertain to colleges within town and city limits.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The procedures for this study included an examination of the literature, including texts, journals, periodicals, and abstracts of authorities in the field of college and university administration in general, and specifically community college administration as related to the president. A search of research related to the president's role activities was done through Direct Access to Reference

Information (DATRIX), a service of Xerox University Microfilms, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), and Swen Franklin Parson Library. The review of research included the examination of four related doctoral dissertations and five abstracts.[3]

Data for this study were collected by the use of a questionnaire[4] which was mailed out to Illinois public community college board members and presidents, and random samplings of administrators, faculty, and students from the forty-seven public community colleges of Illinois.[5]

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature included the writings and research which had special relevance to the study topic. The review included the following: (1) a review of literature dealing with college presidents' role activities in the United States; (2) a review of research previously conducted dealing with the presidents' role activities; and (3) a review of questionnaires related to leadership roles in secondary education.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

There appeared to be a need for role performance consensus

---

[3]See Appendix A, Summary of Research.

[4]See Appendix B for the study questionaire.

[5]See Appendix C for the college listing.

among local community college board members, administrators, faculty, and students to reach toward the "ideal" and avoid conflicting role expectations. Thus, the following research questions were stated:

1. Presently, in what ways do the two-year, public community college president's present role activities vary from the president's role activities as perceived by board members, administrators, faculties, and students?

2. Has the public community college president's role expectation changed in the past ten years?

The purposes of this study were:

1. to determine the present role activities of the public community college president and determine if these differ according to presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students viewing the president;

2. to determine if the size of an institution affects the perceived present role activities of the college president as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students;

3. to determine if the type of an institution, urban or rural, affects the perceived present role activities of the college president as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students; and

4. to determine if the president is now performing each of the perceived role activities and whether this performance affects the perceived present role activities of the college president as

perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students.

This study reviewed the performance role activities of the president in relation to the community college segments, namely presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students--impinging forces and interdependent in shaping the focus and direction of the college. The study interpreted, through an examination of interdependent activities, a consolidated performance role set which might possibly be utilized as a guide for community college presidents of today and in the future.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses of this study were:

1. The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different according to the perception of presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students.

2. The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different when analyzed by size of college--0 to 2,000; 2,001 plus.

3. The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different when analyzed by type of college--urban/rural.

4. The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students whether the president is either performing or not performing his role activities.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Thomas F. O'Connell, president of Massachusetts' Berkshire Community College stated: "The linchpin of any college is the president. Perhaps we can learn something useful about the community college by focusing on its president and his influence."[6]

The president was viewed as being in an "identity crisis" growing out of the college's identity crisis which, in turn, springs out of the ". . . enduring efforts of junior college leaders to fashion it into a unique educational institution."[7] It became evident that ". . . there has been a shift in the traditional sources of power which have balanced the elements of college governance, and the community colleges have not escaped this shift."[8] The indicators pointed to the fact that the ". . . power may not be in the boards or the president or even in the new faculty unions."[9] The ongoing search for improving and finding ". . . better ways of running a college must focus on several essentials but none more important than the policy makers and administrators themselves."[10]

---

[6]Thomas F. O'Connell, Community Colleges: A President's View (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1968), p. 109.

[7]Arthur M. Cohen and Associates, A Constant Variable (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1971), p. 5.

[8]James I. Wattenbarger, "Who Really Has the Power?" Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 2 (October, 1973), p. 10.

[9]Wattenbarger, p. 10.

[10]William G. Shannon, "aajc [sic] approach," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 2 (October, 1973), p. 6.

The identity crisis of the president's role relative to "traditional administrative practice can be readily contrasted . . . with emerging techniques."[11] The American college administrator was considered by Thornton to be in loco parentis. The president, and later the dean, were perceived by Thornton to have as much right as the parent to control and inquire into the activities of the student and forbid or chastise without concern for inherent rights of the individual. He stated that faculty members were also subject to direction and control by the president. The typical college president was perceived as being ". . . completely autocratic, deciding on appointments, tenure, salaries, budgets, and conditions of work."[12] According to the literature, community college presidents have begun to cultivate more effective ways of administering their roles so that growing frustrations of faculty and students can result in effective change.

Shannon indicated that as social change occurs, the community college president has been, and will continue to be, confronted with the problem of redefining his role through changing activities. Shannon reported, for example, a president works toward developing ". . . a dynamic equilibrium of policy and energy which characterizes the effective college."[13]

---

[11]James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972), p. 114.

[12]Thornton, p. 115.

[13]Shannon, p. 6.

Studies related to presidents reviewed in the literature during the past fifteen years have primarily focused upon the four-year college or university president. Interviews and general surveys provided the data for these descriptive studies. The president's role activities were described as being in a state of flux. Role activity perception, both internally and externally, was expressed in terms of vagueness and uncertainty. There appeared to be general variance and lack of clarity of the president's role activities by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students.

A generalized summary of the review of literature indicated that the organizational structure, position, and size of a college are directly related to the president's role. Additionally, the position expressed in the literature described the president's role as one of vagueness and uncertainty lacking cohesion and clarity from the majority of perspectives.

The public community college was recognized as a series of communities or, according to Kerr, can be labeled a multiuniversity.[14] Kerr reported that the major task of the college or university included: (1) the development of knowledge to provide for local and area citizens' responsibilities; (2) national responsibilities; and (3) for the purpose of knowledge itself which generally provides a service to man.[15] The series of communities in the community college,

---

[14]Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. vi.

[15]Kerr, p. vi.

or "multicollege," and its leadership was perceived as being an entity of the university-at-large and part of the total community.[16] In this role, the community college can be held directly accountable for some of the same responsibilities as the university plus an area of specialized services. Kerr described the evolution of knowledge which brings changing forces in society as an imperative signal for the administrator to evolve new college directions which will have a varied long-range effect.[17]

Presidents of colleges have been perceived in a number of roles; that is, performing a number of varied activities. Kerr identified the president of the large university, or what he calls the multiuniversity, and the community college president, as mediator-innovator as opposed to an educator-leader. The president's role was to mediate between and among the various communities of students, faculty, administrators, and the community-at-large.[18]

Baldridge, in 1971, perceived university governance as falling into one of three categories; namely, political, bureaucratic, or collegial.[19] This study did not encompass the possibility of role defined in all three categories, which would be another means of

---

[16]Kerr, p. 88.

[17]Kerr, p. 88.

[18]Michael R. Ferrari, Profiles of American College Presidents (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1970), p. 13.

[19]J. Victor Baldridge, Academic Governance (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971), p. 15.

interpreting the community college president's role.

According to Dodds, the role activities of the college president could be expected to vary considerably according to the size of the related college and whether it was private or public. The literature indicated the larger the system, the more difficult it was for the president to maintain a systematic and effective organization. In a large system he could more easily be moved away from the concerns of academia to those of public relations and management.[20] As the college became larger, the role activities of the president became more formalized and separate; as the college became centralized, the role of the president involved integrating the college community; as it broadened its relationship to the larger community, the president assumed this larger responsibility.[21]

A generalized summary of the significance of the study, as presented in the literature, included the following:

1. The effectiveness of the total college operation, large or small, whether traditional or non-traditional, relies to a great extent upon the role activities of the president.

2. Out of these role activities evolves a total relationship to the students, faculty, administration, board, and community.

---

[20]Harold W. Dodds, The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker (New York, N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 20.

[21]Kerr, p. 28.

3. The relationship becomes reciprocal in interpretation of how they perceived the president's role and his perception of their role.

4. These impinging forces were prime forces in molding and shaping the president's role.

Of first consideration in this study was the traditional role of the president as presented in the literature and research to date, and the second consideration was made relative to the perception of how students, faculty, administration, boards, and presidents perceived the president's role in terms of performance.

LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The major limitations of this study were as follows:

General

1. The populations studied were limited to public community colleges in the state of Illinois during the fall of 1974.

2. This study did not include members of the general community other than board members who are identified and set apart by their responsiveness and involvement in a leadership role directly related to the college.

3. The questionnaire served as the only source of original data.

4. The review of the literature and research was limited to the period from 1958 to present.

Data Gathering Limitations

1. It was expected that the proximity of participants and the degree to which participants directly, partially, or indirectly related to the president and his performance identified as role activities will bias group responses.

2. Respondents' attitudes to, and understanding of, the presidents' role within each group could have had a definite effect and account for some variance.

3. The instrument itself could have possessed a biasing effect due to the lack of, or inclusion of, certain performance role tasks.

4. There was no accurate measure of the veracity of the replies to the instrument. In employing a self-reporting technique, inaccuracy due to forgetfulness or deceit may have been always possible.

5. It was expected that there were limited data relevant to historical perspective beyond a period of ten years due to the rapid growth of community colleges in recent years.

6. The lack of a representative sampling of part-time students may have biased the study.

7. The lack of representative sampling from outside the State of Illinois restricted generalization beyond the persons and groups described.

A REVIEW OF THE PROCEDURES

The procedures included; the process used in selecting the population; collection of the data; and the proposed methods used in treating and analyzing the data.

THE POPULATION

The population consisted of those Illinois Public Community Colleges listed by the Illinois Community College Board as of October, 1974.[22] There were forty-eight college campuses listed which represented forty separately administered community college districts. Illinois Community College Districts separately administered include: the multi-campus systems of the City Colleges of Chicago, Illinois Eastern Community Colleges, and Black Hawk Colleges. Eighty percent of the forty separately administered colleges participated in this study. Table 1 indicates these categories.

Table 1

Participants

Total Colleges	48
Separately Administered Colleges	40
Participation by College Choice	29

Participation varied from participation by only the president to all-inclusive participation including the president, board members, administrators, faculty, and students. Colleges were

[22] See Appendix C for Illinois Public Community College Listing.

given the opportunity to voluntarily participate through contacting the president's office.

METHOD OF GATHERING DATA

The data gathered related to the expected and actual role activities, in terms of performance, and change in role activities of public community college presidents. The method utilized in gathering data was the questionnaire presented in Appendix B. A questionnaire was used to gather data; follow-up personal contact was used when needed.

The questionnaire consisted of thirty-seven direct response questions, adapted from Gross, plus one additional question.[23] Question number 38 was an open-ended question designed to encourage the respondents to record specific observed changes and provide any input the participant felt the need to indicate relative to points that may have been overlooked in the first thirty-seven questions.

The questionnaire was designed to:

1. determine, in terms of performance, the role activity expectations held by students, faculty, administration, presidents, and boards;

2. determine actual performance of specific activities by community college presidents;

3. determine, in terms of performance, changes in role

---

[23] See Appendix B, Questionnaire, Cover Letter, and Response Form.

activities of the community junior college president; and

4. determine the top five performance activity priorities listed by the students, faculty, administration, presidents, and boards.

The study questionnaire, with permission, was based on a role definition instrument presented by Dr. Neal Gross (Professor of Education and Sociology at Harvard University) in Explorations in Role Analysis. Dr. Loren E. Klaus also utilized this instrument, with minor adaptations, for his study of presidents and board members.

Gross's questionnaire was adapted by making the following word transpositions:

Words Used by Gross	Words Used for This Study
School Committees	College Board
School	College
His	His/Her
Vacant teaching positions	Vacancies on the college staff
Teacher	Faculty Member
Newspapers	Local News Media

It was necessary to change the words indicated in Item 1 through Item 37. These were determined to be necessary to focus the instrument from the public school to the college. Validation of the

instrument attained by Gross was further supported by field testing the instrument.

The instrument was reviewed by staff of the Computer Center at Northern Illinois University thereby obtaining the counsel and needed direction to design an instrument which could be computer scanned. The instrument was designed to allow computer computation of total response ranges, means, and median scores for each college and group within the college.

The questionnaire consisted of three basic sections. The first section of thirty-seven items was designed to measure role activity expectations for performances of local community college presidents. The second section identified specifics the president does or does not do. The third section, Item 38, prioritized the top five items perceived by respondents as being most important. The questionnaire included 116 total items.[24]

Students, faculty, administration, presidents, and board members completed the same questionnaire. They presented their views related to the role activity performance of the president and whether or not the president actually performed these tasks.

The questionnaire was designed to measure "self-reported" practice as well as "perceived" practice related to the activity described in each questionnaire item. This procedure served as a double-check on the accuracy of the questionnaire.

---

[24]See Appendix B for Questionnaire.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA

Role activity expectations held for the position of public community college presidents in Illinois and perceived role activities were examined.

The frequency Chi-square test of independence was utilized. Statistically significant differences in role activity expectations held for the position were determined by applying the frequency Chi-square (χ^2) tests of independence. The level of significance was set at the .05 level. The purpose of the statistical analysis was to determine whether or not respondent groups held conflicting expectations for the performance of presidents on the various activities presented in the questionnaire.

The Chi-square test determined whether an actual frequency varied significantly from a theoretical or expected frequency. Frequency pertained to the number of times a given item occurs in the data. The term f_o means frequency obtained, f_e means frequency expected. It was necessary to compare obtained results with results to be expected on the basis of chance.

The formula used in calculating the Chi-square was

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{f_o - f_e}{f_e}$$

The computer value of χ^2 was determined to be significant by

comparing it to a table of χ^2 values. Chi-square values were significant at the .05 level of confidence.[25]

Testing Hypothesis 1

Responses on each questionnaire item were computed utilizing the following model:

Perceptions of	Absolutely Must	Preferably Should	Absolutely Must Not
Students			-
Faculty			
Administration			-
Presidents			
Board Members			

(37 Chi-squares)

[25] Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 150-153.

Testing Hypothesis 2

Responses on each questionnaire item were computed utilizing the following model:

	Status Groups (Students, Faculty, Administration, Presidents Board		
	AM	PS	AMN
SMALL			
LARGE			

(37 Chi-squares)

Testing Hypothesis 3

Responses on each questionnaire item were computed utilizing the following model:

	Status Groups (Students, Faculty, Administration, Presidents Board		
	AM	PS	AMN
URBAN			
RURAL			

(37 Chi-squares)

Testing Hypothesis 4

Responses on each questionnaire item were computed utilizing the following model:

	Students	Faculty	Admin.	Presidents	Board
YES					
NO					

(Result: 37 items x 5 = 185 Chi-squares)

The preceding four Chi-square charts were utilized to gain the level of probability for each of the thirty-seven items as related to the four hypotheses. These probabilities provided the descriptive statistics presented in Chapter 4.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

This study investigated the role activities of the community college president according to the perception of presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students; the effects on the president's activities by size of college: 0 to 2,000 and 2,001 plus (full-time enrollments); the effects of being rural or urban; and whether or not the president actually performs certain of these activities. The major statistic employed was Chi-Square. A total of 148 Chi-square analyses were used. Other statistical procedures helped to refine the results. Comparison of probabilities was used to help analyze the prior and present expectations of activities which reflect change. The results of these procedures are presented herein.

DATA PRODUCING SAMPLE

Three hundred and thirteen persons participated in this study. Two questionnaires were not completed when received and were removed from further consideration. The number of subjects who appeared in each variable category is presented in Table 2. Five status levels participated in the study which include board members, presidents,

Table 2

Number of Subjects in Each Variable Category

Variable	Category	n
Status	Board Members	33
	Presidents	21
	Administrators	103
	Faculty	95
	Students	60
	Unclassified	1
Experience	1 to 5 years	188
	6 to 10 years	102
	Over 10 years	23
Enrollment	0 to 2,000	132
	2,001 plus	181
College	Rural	147
	Urban	164
	Unclassified	2

administrators, faculty and students. Since the subjects were randomly assigned by status, the presidents category was limited in participants, with the possibility of only one from each college. Subjects categorized themselves, their experience, their college size and college as indicated in Table 2.

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESES 1 THROUGH 4

Hypotheses 1 through 4 were tested by using a Chi-square statistic. The results of this statistic appear in Table 3 through Table 154, in the original study.

The results presented in these tables indicated that the president's role activities on certain items probably were not due to chance variation among samples ($p < .05$). The results due to the remaining variables were not significant at the .05 level.

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS 1

H_1: The present college president's perceived role activity expectations are different according to the perception of presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students.

The first hypothesis was that each of the thirty-seven role activity expectations are different when analyzed by varying status groups--board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students. This hypothesis was tested by a Chi-square statistic. A summary of the thirty-seven Chi-square tests is provided in Table 3. In this table, the column headed "Probability" describes the probability that the differences found were due to chance. The results for items which have not met the .05 criterion level previously established are labeled "n.s.," which means "not significant."

Table 3

Results of Chi-Square (χ^2) Procedures for Each Item of the EXPECTATIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' PERFORMANCES FOR ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES Questionnaire by Status Groups - Present

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
1	17.85	05
2	16.15	05
3	21.85	01
4	13.19	ns
5	27.38	01
6	8.41	ns
7	4.93	ns
8	24.36	01
9	10.02	05
10	14.77	ns
11	23.43	01
12	10.61	ns
13	19.52	01
14	23.40	01
15	12.63	ns
16	33.42	01
17	28.02	01
18	38.02	01
19	18.24	05
20	11.38	ns
21	16.27	05
22	31.90	01
23	46.84	01
24	15.17	ns
25	5.61	ns

Table 3 (continued)

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
26	6.83	ns
27	27.97	01
28	18.25	05
29	11.14	ns
30	4.33	ns
31	5.42	ns
32	5.68	ns
33	14.77	ns
34	2.24	ns
35	77.94	01
36	7.25	ns
37	8.13	ns

Note: In the original study--

Table 4 through Table 22 present the results of Chi-square analysis for the nineteen significant role activity expectation items from Items 1 through 37 when analyzed by status groups--board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students. The data presented in Tables 4 through 22 relate to Hypothesis 1.

SAMPLE TABLE & EXPLANATION

Table 4 presents the Chi-square results for Item 1. An examination of the findings of this analysis indicates that the majority of the sample prefer that the president be responsible for making recommendations for the appointment, promotion, or dismissal of subordinates on the basis of merit alone. The proportion of board members (51.6%), presidents (61.9%), and administrators (46.1%) indicated that the president should be performing this activity is greater than the proportion of faculty (32.6%) and students (31.0%). The difference between the groups was significant at the .05 level.

Table 4. Chi-Square Results of Perceived Role Activity Expectations for Item 1, Make recommendations for the appointment, promotion, or dismissal of subordinates on the basis of merit alone, When Analyzed by Status Groups

Groups Analyzed	Absolutely Must	Preferably Should	Absolutely Must Not	Total
Board Members	16 (51.6%)	12 (38.7%)	3 (9.7%)	31
Presidents	13 (61.9%)	8 (38.1%)	0 (0.0%)	21
Administrators	47 (46.1%)	44 (43.1%)	11 (10.8%)	102
Faculty	30 (32.6%)	46 (50.0%)	16 (17.4%)	92
Students	18 (31.0%)	25 (43.1%)	15 (25.9%)	58
Total	124	135	45	304

Chi-Square = 17.85 p = .05

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS II

H_2: The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different when analyzed by size of college--0 to 2,000; 2,001 plus.

The second hypothesis was that each of the thirty-seven role activity expectations are different when analyzed by small (0 to 2,000) or large (2,001 plus) colleges was tested by a Chi-square statistic. A summary of the thirty-seven Chi-square tests is provided in Table 23. In this table, the column headed "Probability" describes the probability that the differences found were due to chance. The results for items which have not met the .05 criterion level previously established are labeled "n.s.," which means "not significant."

Table 23

Results of Chi-Square (χ^2) Procedures for Each Item of the EXPECTATIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' PERFORMANCES FOR ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES Questionnaire by Enrollment

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
1	6.38	05
2	3.45	ns
3	9.79	01
4	1.27	ns
5	4.05	ns
6	1.44	ns
7	2.05	ns
8	10.14	01
9	1.25	ns
10	1.97	ns
11	.30	ns
12	1.54	ns
13	.13	ns
14	3.97	ns
15	4.38	ns
16	1.81	ns
17	2.31	ns
18	.31	ns
19	3.73	ns
20	3.98	ns
21	1.69	ns
22	1.03	ns
23	.12	ns
24	.12	ns
25	.07	ns

Table 23 (continued)

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
26	5.97	ns
27	1.85	ns
28	.81	ns
29	.25	ns
30	4.60	ns
31	.20	ns
32	2.33	ns
33	1.28	ns
34	.07	ns
35	3.39	ns
36	.36	ns
37	.68	ns

Note: In the original study--

Table 24 through Table 26 present the results of Chi-square analysis for the three significant role expectation items from Items 1 through 37 when analyzed by small (0 to 2,000) or large (2,0001 plus) colleges. The data presented in Tables 24 through 26 relate to Hypothesis 2.

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS III

H_3: The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different when analyzed by type of college--urban/rural.

The third hypothesis was that each of the thirty-seven role activity expectations are different when analyzed by rural and urban colleges was tested by a Chi-square statistic. A summary of the thirty-seven Chi-square tests is provided in Table 27. In this table, the column headed "Probability" describes the probability that the differences found were due to chance. The results for items which have not met the .05 criterion level previously established are labeled "n.s.," which means "not significant."

Table 27

Results of Chi-Square (χ^2) Procedures for Each Item of the EXPECTATIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' PERFORMANCES FOR ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES Questionnaire by College

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
1	3.73	ns
2	6.42	05
3	.59	ns
4	1.30	ns
5	.85	ns
6	2.23	ns
7	1.40	ns
8	.37	ns
9	.66	ns
10	7.90	05
11	.14	ns
12	.08	ns
13	.04	ns
14	3.43	ns
15	9.51	01
16	1.05	ns
17	3.95	ns
18	3.87	ns
19	5.35	ns
20	.31	ns
21	1.93	ns
22	5.19	ns
23	2.45	ns
24	7.34	05
25	1.78	ns

Table 27 (continued)

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
26	3.30	ns
27	.29	ns
28	3.51	ns
29	1.89	ns
30	.86	ns
31	2.09	ns
32	1.68	ns
33	.92	ns
34	.05	ns
35	.64	ns
36	.55	ns
37	5.07	ns

Note: In the original study--

Table 28 through Table 31 present the results of Chi-square analysis for four signigficant role activity expectation items from Items 1 through 37 when analyzed by type of college--rural/urban. The data presented in Tables 28 through 31 relate to Hypothesis 3.

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO HYPOTHESIS IV

H_4: The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students when analyzed by whether the president is either performing or not performing his role activities.

The fourth hypothesis was that each of the thirty-seven role activity actual performances is different when analyzed by status groups was tested by a Chi-square statistic. A summary of the thirty-seven Chi-square tests is provided in Table 32. In this table, the column headed "Probability" describes the probability that the differences found were due to chance. The results for items which have not met the .05 criterion level previously established are labeled "n.s.," which means "not significant."

Table 32

Results of Chi-Square (χ^2) Procedures for Each Item of the EXPECTATIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' PERFORMANCES FOR ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES Questionnaire by Status Groups of Actual Performance

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
1	19.69	01
2	8.95	ns
3	11.94	05
4	4.30	ns
5	15.13	01
6	3.98	ns
7	11.69	05
8	4.08	ns
9	7.74	ns
10	17.71	01
11	6.37	ns
12	6.55	ns
13	7.15	ns
14	14.95	01
15	9.69	ns
16	26.77	01
17	9.40	ns
18	18.78	01
19	4.82	ns
20	21.17	01
21	1.22	ns
22	16.24	01
23	22.04	01
24	19.05	01
25	13.82	01

Table 32 (continued)

Item	Chi-Square	Probability
26	25.06	01
27	31.79	01
28	4.29	ns
29	13.25	01
30	24.76	01
31	7.63	ns
32	8.77	ns
33	3.30	ns
34	12.19	05
35	18.18	01
36	23.64	01
37	8.52	ns

Note: In the original study--

Table 33 through Table 52 present the results of Chi-square analysis for the twenty significant role activity actual performance items from Items 1 through 37 when analyzed by status groups. The data presented in Tables 33 through 52 relate to Hypothesis IV.

FINDINGS COMPARING PRIOR AND PRESENT ROLE ACTIVITY EXPECTATIONS

No specific hypothesis was formulated regarding prior and present role activity expectations. Table 53 consequently displays in a descriptive way the manner in which various status groups responded to the role activity expectations questionnaire when considering the prior role expectations compared to their present role expectations. The summary table provides a Chi-square analysis with its corresponding probability function based first on the prior expectations and then on the present expectations of the various status groups for each item.

Table 53

A Comparison of Chi-Square Results for Items 1 through 37
According to PRIOR and PRESENT Role Activity Expectations
When Analyzed by Status Groups

Item	Prior Expectations		Present Expectations	
	Chi-Square	Probability	Chi-Square	Probability
1	26.26	.00	17.85	.02
2	28.74	.00	16.15	.04
3	31.02	.00	21.85	.00
4	10.25	.25	13.19	.11
5	28.14	.00	27.38	.00
6	5.90	.66	8.41	.39
7	2.86	.94	4.93	.77
8	10.42	.24	24.36	.00
9	17.83	.02	10.02	.04
10	10.77	.22	14.77	.06
11	24.46	.00	23.43	.00
12	5.66	.68	10.61	.23
13	18.79	.02	19.52	.01
14	13.90	.08	23.40	.00
15	12.20	.14	12.63	.13
16	20.15	.01	33.42	.00
17	22.51	.00	28.02	.00
18	40.30	.00	38.02	.00
19	17.13	.03	18.24	.02
20	7.40	.49	11.38	.18
21	15.25	.05	16.27	.04
22	64.96	.00	31.91	.00
23	61.84	.00	46.84	.00
24	20.60	.01	15.17	.06

Table 53 (continued)

Item	Prior Expectations		Present Expectations	
	Chi-Square	Probability	Chi-Square	Probability
25	21.96	.01	5.61	.69
26	10.30	.24	6.83	.55
27	19.24	.01	27.97	.00
28	27.98	.00	18.25	.02
29	17.63	.02	11.14	.19
30	8.66	.37	4.33	.83
31	.82	1.00	5.42	.71
32	6.07	.64	5.68	.68
33	11.33	.18	14.77	.06
34	5.07	.75	2.24	.97
35	68.36	.00	77.94	.00
36	10.69	.22	7.25	.51
37	14.75	.06	8.13	.42

An examination of the over-all trend of the various Chi-square analyses shows that a majority of the items' probability levels decreased. This indicates an increased divergence of role expectation between status groups when one examines present expectations. Eight items' probability levels remained constant. All other items' probability levels increased in value indicating that the various status groups were not as divergent in these items' role expectations. This comparison lends itself to the clarification of possible patterns of change. These patterns are identified in findings and lend themselves to future research.

FINDINGS PERTAINING TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 38

Questionnaire item 38 is an open-ended question designed to encourage the respondents to record specific observed changes and any input that the participant felt the need to indicate relative to points that may have been overlooked in the first thirty-seven questions. The only required aspect of the question was that the respondents place in a priority list the most important changes that they had witnessed in the role of the community college president.

The results of this question were recorded by respondents in a variety of ways. Some of the respondents did indicate the requested priority listing. Others, however, used the open-ended question to express emotional concerns, recommendations, and theoretical insights. As a result of these mixed mode of responses, a large portion of the sample could not be tallied in a standard form. Table 54 contains, therefore, the five most frequently listed priority change items regarding the role of the community college president. The total responses have been subdivided according to the five status groups. Although the total number does not represent the entire sample, care was exercised to include every response that completed question thirty-eight appropriately.

Table 54

Simple Frequency Count Summary Table of the Five Priority Change Items According to Status Groups

Priority Item	Status Groups					
	Board Members	Presidents	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Total
1. Increased emphasis on accountable administrative/ management techniques with a growing involvement in board-union negotiations.	16	13	69	52	11	161
2. Move toward career curriculums, community based education and other open door policies with less emphasis on academics.	6	4	39	35	6	90
3. Growing emphasis on community involvement and public relations.	9	2	35	22	7	75
4. Increased financial pressures necessitating the president to assume fiscal guardian of tax dollars--greater involvement with funding and budget.	7	5	3	19	38	72

Table 54 (continued)

Priority Item	Status Groups					
	Board Members	Presidents	Administrators	Faculty	Students	Total
5. Subtle change from being a faculty representative and leader to a representative of board policies and contract negotiations--less autonomy and more shared decisions.	8	5	22	22	4	61
Totals	46	29	168	150	66	459

An examination of the results of Table 54 indicates that administrative concerns far outnumber any other concerns. This category was expressed as a priority change in the presidents' role by 161 of the 459 respondents. The second major role was a growing deemphasis in academia. Although this was expressed as a second priority change, the total number of responses were nearly half of the total for the first administrative change item. The final three priority items cluster as a unit indicating an equality of priority concern. Public relations, budget concerns, and a changing role toward faculty relations all fall in a third category of concern.

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents a summary of the study, findings, discussion of the findings, implications for the community college president, and recommendations for further research based on the Illinois respondents.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role activities of presidents of Illinois public community colleges as perceived by the five status groups consisting of board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students. Emphasis was given to the prior, present, and actual role expectations of presidents as viewed by the five status groups.

The need for the study was based on a review of related literature which has evolved over the past ten years. From this review, the following was clear:

1. There was a confusion of a college president's role activities as viewed by board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students.

2. Prior research included investigation of the president's role as viewed by board members, presidents, administrators, and

faculty. Faculty and students were not both included in any given study.

3. Previous studies and writings did not include an interpretation of the president's role by all five status groups (board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students).

4. Prior research did not investigate the inter-relationships of size or type of college on the role activities of college presidents.

5. A generalized summary of the literature indicated that the community college president's role has been viewed in a traditional role.

The hypotheses of the study were stated as:

H_1: The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different according to the perception of presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students.

H_2: The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different when analyzed by size of college--0 to 2,000; 2,001 plus.

H_3: The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different when analyzed by type of college--rural/urban.

H_4: The present college presidents' perçeived role activities are different as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students whether the president is either performing or not performing his role activities.

The major limitations upon which the study was based included:

1. The populations studied were limited to Illinois public community colleges.

2. Status groups were limited to board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students. No other groups were included in the study.

3. The proximity of the status groups in relation to the president was not taken into consideration.

4. Data were limited to a relevant historical perspective of the past ten years due to the rapid growth of community colleges.

The procedure of the study was to administer an already developed and proven questionnaire to community college board members, presidents, administrators, faculty, and students.

The instrument was sent to each of the presidents or staff persons of community colleges in the State of Illinois after obtaining their support through telephone interviews. Each president or staff person was requested to submit the questionnaire to their president, to seven of their board members, to six of their administrators, to six of their faculty, and to six of their students. As a result of this procedure, usable data were obtained from 21 presidents, 33 board members, 103 administrators, 95 faculty, and 60 students ($n = 312$).

The data from the returned questionnaires were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) on the computer.

This package permitted the questionnaire responses to be analyzed utilizing the frequency Chi-square test of independence. The level of significance was set at the .05 level. These results were incorporated into summary tables with interpretive statements.

FINDINGS

The data and findings related to each of the hypotheses for the Illinois sample presented herein is followed by a discussion of more generalized findings.

Hypothesis 1 of the study stated: The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different according to the perception of presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students.

This hypothesis was supported. Data analyzed in this study revealed that nineteen of thirty-seven items reached a level of significance when responses of subjects in the status groups (presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students) were analyzed by the Chi-square technique.

Hypothesis 2 of the study stated: The present college presidents' perceived role activity expectations are different when analyzed by size of college--0 to 2,000; 2,001 plus.

This hypothesis was not supported. Data analyzed in this study revealed that three of thirty-seven items reached a level of significance when responses of subjects in the status groups (presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students)

were analyzed by the Chi-square techniques.

Hypothesis 3 of the study stated: The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different when analyzed by type of college--rural/urban.

This hypothesis was not supported. Data analyzed in this study revealed that four of thirty-seven items reached a level of significance when responses of subjects in the following status groups (presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students) were analyzed by the Chi-square technique.

Hypothesis 4 of the study stated: The present college presidents' perceived role activities are different as perceived by presidents, board members, administrators, faculties, and students whether the president is either performing or not performing his role activities.

This hypothesis was supported. Data analyzed in the study revealed that twenty of thirty-seven items reached a level of significance when responses of subjects in the status groups (presidents, board members, administrators, faculty, and students) were analyzed by the Chi-square technique.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Three independent variables were examined in this investigation: (1) status groups, (2) enrollment, and (3) type of college. In each case, there were significant differences found for specific role activity items. A total of nineteen items were

significant when examined by status groups, three items were significant when examined by enrollment, four items were significant when examined by type of college, and twenty items were significant when examined the second time by status groups. In each case, the findings were significant beyond the .05 level.

It was evident that, of the three independent variables of status groups, enrollment, and type of college, significant differences existed primarily in the area of status groups. The size of college (0 to 2,000/2,001 plus) and the type of college (rural/urban) appeared to have little significance when analyzing the role activities of the president.

A closer examination of the role activity items examined according to status groups indicated that those issues directly related to a specific status group tended to have significant differences in their results. Items related to faculty concerns, for instance, were answered uniformly by the faculty group with that group's responses clustering in either the "absolutely must" or "absolutely must not" categories. The other status groups usually clustered in the "preferably should" category thus accounting for a significant Chi-square result. This pattern was evident for board members, administrators, and students whenever an item specifically related to their vested interests.

A second pattern evident in those items analyzed according to status groups was one in which political skills were the topic of a role activity. In such items, administrators looked favorably

upon the performance of necessary political compromise or even intrigue. This view was not held as strongly by other status groups.

A final pattern was evident when examining the responses of board members. This group consistently gave supportive responses to the president's role as a professional administrator and educator. This was especially evident when examining the "Yes" and "No" responses to the role activities.

A closer examination of the three significant role activity items analyzed according to enrollment indicated three patterns. The first suggested an acceptance by larger colleges of the need for the president to carry out decisions based on political discussions sometimes in spite of inherent worth. A second pattern indicated a strong commitment by larger colleges to make recommendations for appointment, promotion, or dismissal on the basis of merit alone. Smaller colleges did not indicate as strong a commitment to such purity of motive. A final pattern was evidenced by the smaller colleges' acceptance of the role of the president as a monitor of an educator's personal life activities. Although both large and small colleges did not prefer that the president assume this role, smaller colleges had a significantly larger number indicating that this was a viable role activity for the college president.

When examining the four significant role activity items by type of college--rural/urban, two strong patterns emerged. Rural respondents were strongly committed to the need for educational honesty and forthrightness both in expressing opinions publicly and

politically as well as the expression of these ideas to staff members while listening to their own insights. The second pattern was evidenced by the urban colleges. These respondents strongly favored the need of the presidents to openly strive towards gaining equality for minority issues and also to take an active stand against local attacks on educational principles which he/she knows are sound.

An examination of these results showed the consistency of status groups' differences as well as the lack of differences among college enrollments and sizes. The questionnaire, "Expectations for Presidents' Performances for Illinois Public Community Colleges," differentiated well and yet was homogeneous in its differentiation.

Finally, two findings were indicated by respondents regarding the questionnaire itself. The first was with regard to the three response categories "absolutely must," "preferably should," and "absolutely must not." A concern was expressed by approximately 10 percent of the presidents regarding the lack of symmetry in these categories. The need for a "preferably must not" category to avoid bias was indicated. The second insight was from the educational benefits gleaned from the questionnaire. Several respondents noted an increased awareness of their own perceptions regarding the role of a college president.

IMPLICATIONS

On the basis of the findings of this study, achieved through Illinois respondents, concern must be exerted toward the incorporation

of varying status groups' needs in the evolving role of the college president. Ongoing role analysis using group techniques, intra-status discussions, questionnaires, and other methods should be a major priority for the college president as he/she continues to define an acceptable role.

The realization that vested interests are potent realities on the community college campus and that these must be dealt with as well as recognized became apparent in this study. Sensitivity rather than combat must be the mode of operation when the college president is dealing with the needs of status groups. Just as the college president must incorporate the insights of varying status groups on today's college campuses--discussion, open forums, questionnaires, and other such techniques aimed at understanding the needs of status groups must be a part of the college president's role.

An examination of the open-ended response question indicated that the president should examine his role as an accountable administrator. Although management techniques with a growing involvement in board and union negotiations were listed as the top role activity change of the president, this change should not be considered a value judgement. Rather, the listing of accountable management by varying status groups should be considered an issue to be pondered.

The response to Item 38 of the questionnaire also calls for scrutiny regarding the college president's role in encouraging academic development. A movement toward open door policies may be

considered a thrust; however, a corresponding lessening of academic quality must be avoided. A need to look at public relations, budgeting, and faculty leadership accompanied with shared decision making appeared to be other priorities of importance to the changing role of the president.

The findings of this investigation also indicated that the role activities of the president are relatively homogeneous across Illinois community college campuses of varying enrollments or types. The size of the college or environment of the college did not seem to be a major force in determining the president's evolving role.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Several recommendations appeared to be relevant as a result of this study and are presented as follows:

1. A thorough and discriminating analysis of the role of the college president by examining status groups seems appropriate.

2. The development of an instrument that deals with theoretical roles rather than individual role activity items should be considered.

3. An investigation of role activity across larger populations and socio-economic groups is worthwhile.

4. A closer examination of socio-economic status rather than role activity status might be considered in relationship to the president's role.

5. A longitudinal study with expanded samples should also

be undertaken.

6. An identification through future studies of the personal and professional traits needed by the college president today should be undertaken by examining those college presidents who have shown themselves to be successful.

7. An experimental rather than descriptive study should be undertaken so as to identify those variables which account for success or failure in the college presidency.

8. Future studies should incorporate all five status groups, especially student groups (which proved to be significant to the results of this study).

9. It is recommended that this investigation be replicated in states other than Illinois or, in fact, with a random sample of all community college presidents in the United States.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH AS RELATED TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Research -Year Univ.-Abstract	Research Related to	Purpose/Focus of Research	Findings
Graham -1965 U. of Texas D.A. 26-2010	Presidents N=not indicated	Specifics of the President's Job--Acts He/She Performs	19 Significant Items-6 Planning, 4 org., 6-leading, 2-control, 1-Asses
Gross-1959 Harvard	Sch. Supt. N=105 Bd. Mmbrs. N=508	Role expectations-Performance -perceived and actual	Considerable Disagreement
Klaus-1969 Ill. State Coll. D.A. 30-521A	Presidents N=30 Bd. Mmbrs. N=210	Role expectations and performance of Presidents and Beard Members	Considerable Disagreement Pres. vs. Bd. Mmbrs.
LaVire-1961 U. of Fla. D.A. 22-3491	Pres. Task N=82	Comparison of functions/tasks to Southern States Standards	Task Commonality identified
Robinson-1963 Fla. State Univ. D.A. 24-3406	Schl. Supts., Bd. Mmbrs., Adv. Com.	Perceptions of Presidents, et al., functions, qualifications and problems	Definite misunderstanding and lack of information
Sidlinger-1962 Columbia Univ. D.A. 22-3491	Presidents N=240	Role of Presidents as perceived by self projection and responsibilities	Ranking of Responsibilities and neglected areas
Stamm-1968 New Mexico State D.A. 29-1092A	Presidents N=40 Boards N=12 Deans N=17 Faculty N=17	Role expectations related to Boards, Deans, Faculty used as reference groups-effectiveness and performance	Bds. & Pres.-Close Pres. & Deans were congruent, Pres. & Faculty coincided
Upton-1969 U. of Mich. DA 30-3656A	Presidents N=20 Faculty N=506 Trustees N=73	Role expectations and behavior expected	Differences at all three levels
Weynand-1963 U. of Texas D.A. 24-2343	College Admin's. N=167 from 30 col.	Determine the role of Public Junior Colleges	No all-inclusive or unifying college role
Wilson-1958 State Col.-Wash. D.A. 19-476	Administrators N=50	Organization and administrative Practices-Supts., Admin., Registrars, Bursars, Dir. of Stud. Affairs, Dir. of Eve. Colleges	Majority of practices were found to be desirable
Listed in Bibliography			

APPENDIX B-I

EXPECTATIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' PERFORMANCES FOR ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

SPRING, 1975

Questionnaire

A doctoral research study by Thomas R. Scott, Northern Illinois University

---

DEAR RESPONDENT:

In the name of research would you please take fifteen minutes and indicate your response to this questionnaire:

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY: To isolate and identify forces vital to strengthening the administrative leadership role of the public community college president. This project concerns you and your views of the role of the college president. It is designed to test hypotheses relative to: the president's perceived role being different according to various sub-populations, the actual performance of tasks performed by the president, and the changing role of the president.

INSTRUCTIONS:

PART

I. Use a soft lead pencil to blacken the appropriate ovals in items A through D - PERTINENT INFORMATION.

II. Make three pencil (#2) marks indicating your responses under: PRIOR, PRESENT and ACTUAL for Items 1 through 37.

EXAMPLE: AM-Absolutely Must PS-Preferably Should AMN-Absolutely Must Not

PRIOR			ITEM	PRESENT			ACTUAL	
Expectations				Expectations			Does the President do	
AM	PS	AMN		AM	PS	AMN	YES	NO
○	○	●	The president opens his mail.	○	○	●	○	●

III. Complete Item 38

NOTE: Your name as well as that of your college will be coded. Thus, your privacy and confidentially will be preserved.

PART I

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING PERTINENT INFORMATION:

A. Your Status (Check One)

1.	( ) Board Member	7.	( ) Student-Freshman
2.	( ) President	8.	( ) Student-Sophomore
3.	( ) Comptroller	9.	( ) Registrar
4.	( ) Dean	10.	( ) Bursar
5.	( ) Assist. Dean	11.	( ) Librarian
6.	( ) Faculty	12.	( ) Other _____

Please give title

B. You have had this status for 1 2 3 4 5 6-10 11-15 16-25 years (Check One)

C. Your college full-time enrollment is ( ) 0 to 2000; ( ) 2001 plus (Check One)

D. Your college is considered to be ( ) Rural ( ) Urban (Check One)

PART II – Directions

For each item, 1 through 37, please respond to each of the three columns by filling in boxes of your choice using a soft lead pencil.

1. PRIOR – Indicate your expectations of the PRESIDENT at the time you first came to the college.
2. PRESENT – Indicate your present expectations of the PRESIDENT.
3. ACTUAL – Indicate whether 'yes' or 'no', Does the PRESIDENT do this? Leave blank if you do not know.

AM - Absolutely Must PS - Preferably Should AMN - Absolutely Must Not

PRIOR Expectations AM PS AMN	Item	PRESENT Expectations AM PS AMN	ACTUAL Does the Pres. do YES NO
( ) ( ) ( ) 1.	Make recommendations for the appointment, promotion, or dismissal of subordinates on the basis of merit alone.	1. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 2.	Urge people whom he respects to run for positions on the college board.	2. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 3.	Carry out decisions of the college board which he believes to be unsound.	3. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 4.	Favor local firms in the awarding of college contracts even though this may increase college expenses somewhat.	4. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 5.	Accept full responsibility for the decisions of subordinates.	5. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 6.	Keep the office open to all community members at all times.	6. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 7.	Write articles for professional journals which will be of benefit to others in the profession.	7. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 8.	Keep a watchful eye on the personal lives of subordinates.	8. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 9.	Cooperate willingly with researchers who are attempting to advance knowledge.	9. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 10.	Consult with staff members about filling vacancies on the college staff.	10. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 11.	Refuse to recommend the dismissal of a staff or faculty person the public wants dismissed if he/she feels that the public complaint is invalid.	11. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )
( ) ( ) ( ) 12.	Speak to all major civic groups at least once a year.	12. ( ) ( ) ( )	( ) ( )

PRIOR Expectations AM PS AMN		Item	PRESENT Expectations AM PS AMN	ACTUAL Does the Pres. do YES NO
000	13.	Have on paper a long range local community college development plan.	13. 000	00
000	14.	Seek able people for open positions rather than considering only those who apply.	14. 000	00
000	15.	Give consideration to local values or feelings regarding race, religion, national origin, in filling vacant staff positions.	15. 000	00
000	16.	Take directions from individual board members.	16. 000	00
000	17.	"Play up to" influential local citizens.	17. 000	00
000	18.	Defend the staff from attack when they try to present the pros and cons of various controversial social and political issues.	18. 000	00
000	19.	Give a helping hand to college board members who are coming up for re-election.	19. 000	00
000	20.	Eliminate from the staff any political ideologists who might be accused of being "leftist" or "rightist."	20. 000	00
000	21.	Secure outside help from "experts" when administrative and program changes are being considered.	21. 000	00
000	22.	Establish regular channels of communication with local news media.	22. 000	00
000	23.	Help staff to get higher salaries.	23. 000	00
000	24.	Fight continuously against any local attacks on educational principles or methods which he/she knows are sound.	24. 000	00
000	25.	Encourage the formation of local committees to cooperate with the college board in studying college problems.	25. 000	00
000	26.	Compile a list of the general characteristics desired in the administrative and teaching staff.	26. 000	00
000	27.	Occasionally compromise with local pressure groups.	27. 000	00
000	28.	Make no major staff or program changes without first seeking public support and approval.	28. 000	00
000	29.	Take a definite stand against any unreasonable demands which may come from local taxpayers.	29. 000	00
000	30.	Make program or curriculum changes without consulting the staff or faculty.	30. 000	00
000	31.	Take a neutral stand on any issue on which the community is evenly split.	31. 000	00
000	32.	Personally inspect all college plants (buildings) at least once a year.	32. 000	00
000	33.	Avoid involvement with factional groups in the community.	33. 000	00
000	34.	Read most of the professional education journals.	34. 000	00
000	35.	Help the college board resist demands by faculty for higher salaries.	35. 000	00
000	36.	Give more consideration to cost factors than educational needs in drawing up the budget.	36. 000	00
000	37.	Work on committees sponsored by the state department of educational and professional organizations.	37. 000	00

(This questionnaire is adapted with permission of Dr. Loren Klaus, Illinois State University, and Dr. Neal Gross, Harvard University.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

PART III

38. You have personally witnessed certain changes in emphasis in the role of the community college president during your period of time with the college. Please list, in priority, the five changes you consider to be the most important.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Thank you for your help and cooperation. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Robert C. Mason, Ed.D.
Committee Chairperson
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

Thomas R. Scott,
Doctoral Candidate
Dean of Extended Learning
Central YMCA Community College

If you would like to receive a copy of the results of this questionnaire, please fill in your name and address---

Name _____

Address _____

City/State _____ Zip_____

Central YMCA Community College
of the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago
211 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606

April 23, 1975

Dear

In accord with our earlier conversation you generously volunteered to expedite the distribution of the enclosed questionnaire, "Expectations for Presidents' Performances for Illinois Public Community Colleges." A wide range of responses will be needed to assure validity in the study. I am relying on you to assist in gathering a full response from your institution.

This questionnaire is the core of my doctoral study designed to gather research data related to the changing role of the College President as perceived by the President and representatives of various areas within your college.

Please distribute the questionnaire to the following twenty-six representatives of the college:

President	1	Faculty	(Full Time)	6
Board Members	7	Students	(Full Time)	3 Freshmen
Administration	6			3 Sophomores

Request respondents to take 10 to 15 minutes of their already busy schedules to complete the questionnaire and return it to me no later than May 14th. The code number on each questionnaire is to insure anonymity while providing the researcher with a record for follow-up. It would be most helpful if you would record the names and phone numbers of those receiving the questionnaire on the attached sheet to help me with retrieval. Return this list with your questionnaire response.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. THANK YOU.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Scott
Doctoral Candidate-NIU
(312/222-8296)
Dean of Extended Learning
Central YMCA Community College

Robert C. Mason, Ed.D.
Committee Chairperson
Northern Illinois University

TRS/bm

Three locations in the Loop: 211 West Wacker Drive/19 South LaSalle/29 West Randolph Street
High School/College/Continuing Education Division/Developmental Institute/English Language Institute/Applied Science
Business Administration/Real Estate Institute/Secretarial Institute/Allied Health/Community Services/Liberal Arts and Sciences

APPENDIX B-3

EXPECTATIONS FOR PRESIDENTS

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

Reminder: Respond by May 14th, 1975

BOARD MEMBERS — NAME — PHONE

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____
4 _____
5 _____
6 _____
7 _____

PRESIDENT

8 _____

ADMINISTRATORS

9 _____
10 _____
11 _____
12 _____
13 _____
14 _____

FACULTY

15 _____
16 _____
17 _____
18 _____
19 _____
20 _____

STUDENTS

FRESHMEN

21 _____
22 _____
23 _____

SOPHOMORE

24 _____
25 _____
26 _____

PLEASE RETURN THIS WITH YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES*

Adams-Pike County, 539
Quincy

Belleville Area College, 522
Belleville

Black Hawk College, 503
Moline

Black Hawk College East
Kewanee

Carl Sandburg College, 518
Galesburg

City Colleges of Chicago, 508
Chicago

Kennedy-King College

Loop College

Malcolm X College

Mayfair College

Olive-Harvey College

Southwest College

Wilbur Wright College

Urban Skills Institute

College of DuPage, 502
Glen Ellyn

College of Lake County, 532
Grayslake

Community College of Decatur, 537
[Richland Community College]
Decatur

Danville Junior College, 507
Danville

Elgin Community College, 509
Elgin

Highland Community College, 519
Freeport

Illinois Central College, 514
East Peoria

Illinois Eastern Community Colleges, 529
Olney

Lincoln Trail College
Robinson

Olney Central College
Olney

Wabash Valley College
Mt. Carmel

Illinois Valley Community College, 513
Oglesby

John A. Logan College, 525
Carterville

Joliet Junior College, 525
Joliet

Kankakee Community College, 520
Kankakee

Kaskaskia College, 501
Centralia

Kishwaukee College, 523
Malta

Lake Land College, 517
Mattoon

Lewis & Clark Community College, 536
Godfrey

Lincoln Land Community College, 526
Springfield

McHenry County College, 528
Crystal Lake

Moraine Valley Community College, 524
Palos Hills

Morton College, 527
Cicero

North Shore
Northern Chicago Suburb

Oakton Community College, 535
Morton Grove

Parkland College, 505
Champaign

Prairie State College, 515
Chicago Heights

Rend Lake College, 521
Ina

Rock Valley College, 511
Rockford

Sauk Valley College 506
Dixon

Shawnee Junior College, 531
Ullin

Southeastern Illinois College, 533
Harrisburg

Spoon River College, 534
Canton

State Community College of East St. Louis, 601
East St. Louis

Thornton Community College, 510
South Holland

Triton College, 504
River Grove

Waubonsee Community College
Sugar Grove

William Rainey Harper College, 512
Palatine

*Community College Bulletin, a publication of the Illinois Community College Board, Vol. 9, No. 3 (October, 1974).